

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending, specifically claims 1, 3 – 8, 10 – 23, 25 and 26, are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 18, 23, 25 and 26 are amended and claims 2, 9 and 24 are canceled. Claims 3, 10, 14 and 25 have been amended to depend from pending claims.

Claim 18 has been amended to correct minor grammatical errors. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicant to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., page 10, lines 16 – page 7, lines 1 – 21), and claims and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3 – 8, 10 – 23, 25 and 26 are pending.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1 – 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,608,891 to Pelletier (“Pelletier”). Although Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as originally submitted are not rendered anticipated by Pelletier, the claims have been amended herein to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. The rejections are therefore respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action’s citation to the applied reference, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Office Action’s citations to the applied references is proper, does not disclose, teach or suggest that service control components working in conjunction with application server components to provide one or more services to one or more telephony devices services are, as now recited in applicant’s remaining independent claims 1, 23 and 26.

For explanatory purposes, applicant discusses herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and Pelletier. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Pelletier correspond to the claimed invention. Pelletier discloses a network-based announcement and message delivery service for providing a landline customer with services. A service control point (SCP) provides services to an end user (or subscriber) through various switching devices (for example see col. 6, lines 29 – 41). The SCP includes a database that determines if a particular caller is a subscriber to any services.

The present invention is directed to providing cooperation between the service control components and the application server components to provide services to an end user. The present invention is therefore independent of the end user signaling method being employed. The present invention is advantageously employed on calls, or sessions, when the end user devices employ SIP signaling, as noted in the specification (e.g. page 7, line 17 - page 8, line 9). As is well known in the art, a session is generally used to describe a call in which the end user devices use SIP signaling.

Applicant respectfully submits that Pelletier does not disclose or suggest "one or more application server components" as recited in independent claims 1, 23 and 26. Independent claim 1 further recites that services are provided "through employment of one or more data streams between the service control component and the one or more application server components". Pelletier does not disclose or suggest such data streams. Independent claim 23 recites the step of "providing the one or more services to the one or more telephony devices based on the one or more data streams established between the one or more service control components and the one or more application server components to provide the one or more

services". Such a step of providing a data stream between a service control component and application server components is not disclose or suggested by Pelletier.

Similarly, independent claim 26 recites "means in the one or more media for providing, by one or more service control components communicating with one or more application server components, one or more services to one or more telephony devices on a call through employment of one or more data streams between the one or more service control components and the one or more application server components". Such a means for providing is not disclosed or suggested by Pelletier. Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Pelletier fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicant's independent claims 1, 23 and 26.


For all the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 23, and 26 are believed to not be anticipated by the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 23, and 26, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

For example, Pelletier does not disclose or suggest a "service control component and the one application server component communicate information associated with the one number associated with the one telephony device through employment of the one or more of the one or more data streams" as recited in dependent claim 3. Pelletier further fails to disclose or suggest "the service control component and the one or more of the one or more application server components employ the one or more identifiers to establish the one or more data streams" as recited in dependent claim 10.

Withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: October 5, 2007

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC  
Customer Number 47382